

Two Princeton Papyri Revised

(1) *P.PRINC.* II 78: NO RELEASE

According to its editor, *P.Princ.* II 78 contains a 6th-century petition to the *proximi*¹ of an unnamed city in which the appellant (Philoxenos) seemingly complains that, although he has released a certain Acous, son of Apollos, in the presence of seven witnesses, he has not yet received in return the sum of 2 carats. This view is based upon the reading of ll. 4-8 as follows:

- 4 αὐτικ' ἀπήλλαξα πρὸς Απόλλων<α>
5 τὸν υἱὸν Ἀκοῦτα ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ μαρτύρων
6 ἱκανῶν καὶ μετὰ πολλὰς ἡμέρας
7 τῆς ἀντικαταλλαγῆς καὶ ἔτι
8 ...]. [...] ὧν μοι δύο κεράτια ὑπὲρ, κτλ.
(ll. 9ff. are too damaged to be of further help.)

It takes, perhaps, a little imagination to accept the idea that the words read without any reservation at the start of l. 4 as αὐτικ' ἀπήλλαξα may contain a reading error. Once, however, one realizes that there might be a connection with the word at the start of l. 7, ἀντικαταλλαγῆς, it is no great step to consider changing the opening of l. 4 into ἀντικατήλλαξα.² This proposal could be confirmed on the original papyrus thanks to the kindness of A. E.

¹ For *proximi* as imperial chancery officials, cf. in general A. H. M. Jones, *LRE* I 576 f. and the papyrological references given by S. Daris, *Il Lessico latino nel greco d'Egitto*² (Barcelona 1991) 96; most of these references concern a single *proximus*, but in this papyrus we are apparently dealing with a plurality of *proximi*. It is remarkable that in this case they seem to be in the service of a city.

² For confusions of similar letters like υ/ν and π/τ, see H.C. Youtie, *The Textual Criticism of Documentary Papyri: Prolegomena* (London 1974). His second appendix (pp. 68-69) offers a table of individual letters or letter combinations which have been confused with other letters.

Hanson, who prefers to dot the first three letters (i.e. read ἀντικατήλλαξα). The issue in this petition now turns out to be a complaint about apparently unfulfilled conditions regarding an exchange (ἀντικαταλλαγή) of some (unidentified) property; for this type of document see now *P.Kell.Gr.* I 30, introd. (p. 88; a reference to *BGU XI* 2137.12ff. may be added there). By way of hypothesis it may be suggested that Philoxenos and Apollon, the son of Akoutas, agreed to exchange some property owned by each person respectively, and that, as the value of Apollon's property was not exactly equivalent to Philoxenos' property, it was agreed that Apollon would pay some extra money (cf. the situation in the exchange of donkeys *P.Wisc.* I 15). In that scenario it seems conceivable that one should supply at the start of l. 8 a participle like ὀφειλομένων (there are no traces of ink preserved which could plead against this), while in that case κεράρτια in the same line would contain, then, an error for κεραιών. The complaint would be, then, about non-payment after all of the extra money originally agreed upon for making the exchange. The whole passage may be translated, then, as:

"I made an exchange of property with Apollon, the son of Akoutas, in the presence of seven competent witnesses, and after many days of the exchange (i.e.: many days after the exchange was made) and while two carats were still owed to me for ..."

The number of 7 witnesses finds a parallel in 3 papyri from Syene, *P.Lond.* V 1731.42-48 (A.D. 585), *P.Monac.* I 8.43-49 (A.D. 575-600) and 9.103-110 (A.D. 585), but this is, of course, not sufficient reason to assign the Princeton text to that particular place. For a discussion of witnesses occurring in Byzantine papyri and some interesting observations on their regional spread and number (remarkably enough, e.g., witnesses seem hardly to occur in contracts from Oxyrhynchus) see H.J. Wolff, "Der byzantinische Urkundenstil Ägyptens im Lichte der Funde von Nessana und Dura," *RIDA*, 3^e série, 8 (1961) 115-154, esp. 126-34.

(2) *P.PRINC.* II 92: A NEW ΑΠΑΙΤΗΤΗC

P.Princ. II 92 is a receipt for poll-tax (ἀνδριμύς). Thanks to the large number of poll-tax receipts from Byzantine Egypt published by C. Wessely in *SPP* III and VIII (= *P.Kl.Form.*) and by many

other scholars elsewhere such receipts are well known.³ They feature various formulas; in general the scribes register the date of issue of the receipt, the tax, the tax year (indiction), the instalment, the tax-district, the payer's name + profession, the amount paid, a witness, and the scribe's own name. In one receipt one may find all these elements (cf., e.g., *SPP* III 616), but often enough one or more elements may be lacking. Moreover, the sequence of these elements may differ greatly. One can certainly discern certain patterns, which seem to be determined by the locality where the receipt was issued; each individual tax district had its own scribes with, at least within certain boundaries, their individual manner of formulating. As the editor of the Princeton receipt notes, 'nothing analogous to this text appears among the texts published in *P.Kl.Form*'. He transcribed:

- 1 †Θῶθ ι, ἔχχ(ον) διὰ Couῖρος
- 2 ἀνδηρμὸς δεικάτης
- 3 ἰ(ν)δ(ικτίονος) ἀρ(ί)θ(μιον) ζ' ἕκτον ἀ(πὸ) μη(νὸς)
- 4 Πα(ῦνι). Φοι(βάμμ)ω(ν) παῖ(ς ?) στοιχε(ῖ). †

1, Couῖρος: spelling error for Couήρου? 2, ἀνδηρμὸς: a garbled form of ἀνδρισμοῦ; δεικάτης: a spelling error of δεκάτης.

One might translate this receipt as: "Thoth 10; I received through Severos (?) for *andrismos* of the tenth indiction 1/6 *arithmion* (sc. *solidus*), one sixth, from the month of Pauni (onwards?). Phoebammon, child/slave (?) agrees."

In ll. 3-4, however, there are two problems. We have no parallel for a precise indication of the installment of the payment as apparently expressed by the phrasing ἀ(πὸ) μη(νὸς) Πα(ῦνι); normally one finds such an installment expressed by an indication of the καταβολή (on the number of these καταβολαί in Byzantine tax receipts see *CPR* VIII, p. 205 n. 1). Furthermore, there is a problem with παῖ(ς) in l. 4; so much is certain that to date there are no tax-receipts for poll-tax signed by a slave or by children.⁴

³ A study of these is being made by I. J. Poll.

⁴ On the meaning of παῖς cf. G. Stanton, "Τέκνον, παῖς and related words in Koine Greek," *Proc. XVIII* [1986] *Congr. of Papyrology*, I [Athens 1988] 462-480.

At our request A. E. Hanson kindly checked the original papyrus for us and sent us a drawing of the passage under review. We find⁵ that the alleged α of $\acute{\alpha}(\pi\omicron)$ in l. 3 is hardly distinguishable from a Byzantine δ , so one might think about reading $\delta(\iota\acute{\alpha})$. Furthermore, the editor's π at the start of l. 4 may be a ν as well,⁶ while a mark of abbreviation after the following α is absent. Finally, we wish to observe that such Byzantine tax receipts were often enough issued by an $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota\tau\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ (cf. B. Palme, *Das Amt des $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota\tau\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ in Ägypten* [Wien 1989] 101). We think, therefore, that in l. 3 one should place a full stop after $\xi\kappa\tau\omicron\nu$ and read thereafter: $\Delta(\iota\acute{\alpha}) \text{ Μη-} \mid \nu\tilde{\alpha} \text{ Φοι(β\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu)\omega(\nu\omicron\varsigma) <\acute{\alpha}>\pi\alpha\iota(\tau\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon)^7 \text{ στοιχ(ε\acute{\iota})}$, i.e. "Through Menas, son of Phoibammon, *apaitetes*, (who) agrees."⁸ For the formula $\Delta(\iota\acute{\alpha}) \dots \text{στοιχ(ε\acute{\iota})}$, cf., e.g., P.Lond. V 1750.8 and 1744.4. The use of the term $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\iota\varsigma\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ in this Byzantine tax receipt (for which see J. Gascou in *JESHO* 26 [1983] 101ff.) makes us suppose that the text may be attributed to Upper Egypt, in particular to the Hermopolite nome (cf. the forthcoming edition of P.New York. inv. # 41 by K.A. Worp and P.J. Sijpesteijn); likewise, the $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\iota\varsigma\mu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ -receipts *Pap.Lugd. Bat.* XIX 24, *SB* XIV 11332 and P.Mich.inv. 3448 (publ. in *Anal. Pap.* 5 [1994] 126-27; see *PSI XXI Congr.* 19.4n.) may be also attributed to this region.

I.J. POLL and K.A. WORP

University of Amsterdam

⁵ We wish to thank P. J. Sijpesteijn for kindly discussing this passage with us.

⁶ On the confusion between ν and π in Byzantine handwriting see *CPR* VIII 71.4n., where the question of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu / \acute{\epsilon}\pi$ 'Αρ() is discussed. Another example of the misreading of $\acute{\epsilon}\pi$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is to be found in *BGU* I 315.4 (cf. the plate in Wilcken's *Tafeln* XVIII.b and *P.Tebt.* II p. 370); we owe this reference to the kindness of N. Kruit (Leiden).

⁷ Or possibly $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota(\tau\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon)$? Cf. other instances of tiny alphas occurring in Byzantine papyri, e.g. in *CPR* VIII 82.4 [and see *ibidem*, p. 192].

⁸ An $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota\tau\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ Menas, son of Phoibammon, is not yet listed by Palme, *op.cit.*